

R E M A R K S

The preceding amendment and following remarks are submitted in response to the presently outstanding Official Action of the examiner. Having fully responded to each objection and ground of rejection of the examiner, all pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Entry of these amendments and reconsideration by the examiner to that end is respectfully requested.

The examiner objected to claims 2-13 and 15-26 because, at line 1 of claims 2-13 and 15-26, before "apparatus", "An" should be replaced with --The--. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11-14, 16-21 and 25-26 to make appropriate correction.

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the preamble of claim 1 is drawn to a subcombination of an apparatus comprising a hinge member and a support frame per se whereas line 3 appears to positively recite "rotatable attached to the camera", thus implying a combination claim. The Examiner further stated that, at lines 12 and 13, "being substantially parallel to a first surface" is a combination claim. The Examiner further stated that, at lines 20-28, "the object having a second surface . . . , the camera being maintained . . . " is also

A

claiming a combination. The Examiner stated that it is not clear whether Applicant intends to claim a subcombination or a combination.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly identify the "work pieces" in the preamble and thereby focus upon the elements of the invention, e.g. the hinge member and the support frame, in the claim body. Applicant has amended the preamble of claim 1 to recite "a camera having a lens on an object, the object having a first surface and a second surface" wherein a thickness between the first surface and the second surface defines an edge therebetween. Applicant has also amended other portions of claim 1 to be consistent with the above changes.

The Examiner stated that in claim 2, lines 3-6, "said second portion supporting the camera" and "said second portion are engaging the first surface" are claiming combination. In response, Applicant has amended claim 2 to remove the language "said first portion and said second portions supporting the camera in" and replace it with "the support frame being in...".

The Examiner stated that in claim 3, line 2 "to releasably hold and protect the camera" is a combination claim. Claim 3 has been cancelled.

The Examiner stated that on lines 2, 3, 5, 8, and 9 of claim 4, "comprises the camera" and "to protect a lens of the camera" are claiming combination. In response Applicant

has amended claim 4 to make it clear that the camera is a "work piece" and to make other clarifications.

The Examiner stated on lines 2, 3, 6, and 7 of claim 5, "to protect the lens of the camera" and "the camera" are a combination claim. In response, Applicant has amended claim 5, and it is clear that the camera and the lens of the camera are "work pieces" and to make other amendments for clarification.

The Examiner stated that in claims 6 and 7, lines 2-7, "support the camera" and "engage the first surface" are claiming combination. In response, Applicant has amended claims 6 and 7 to clarify inventive structure and "work pieces".

The Examiner stated on lines 2, 5, 7, and 8 of claim 8, "support camera", "engage the first and the second surfaces", and "a center of gravity of the camera" are not a subcombination claim. In response, Applicant has amended claim 8 to remove "first portion and the second portion support the camera" to replace it with "support frame". Applicant has amended claim 8 to remove any ambiguity regarding combination/subcombination issues.

The Examiner states in lines 1 and 3 of Claims 9 and 10, "the object" and "the first surface" are not claiming subcombination. In response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 9 and 10.

The Examiner states that in claim 11, lines 1, 3 and 4,

"the object", and "the second surface", and "the first surface" are a combination claim. In response, Applicant has amended claim 11 to make amendments to further clarify the combination/subcombination issues.

The Examiner stated that in claim 12, line 4, "rotatably attaching the camera" is claiming combination. In response, Applicant has amended claim 12 to define the interaction between the work piece, the camera, and the body, an element of the invention.

The Examiner stated on lines 1 and 6 of claim 13, "the camera" is a combination claim. In response, Applicant has amended claim 13 to remove "the camera" as an element of the invention.

The Examiner stated that claims 14-26 have the same §112 problems of combination and subcombination as indicated in the above claims 1-14. In response, Applicant has amended these claims to overcome the §112 problems of combination and subcombination as were discussed above.

Applicant has added newly presented claims 27-29. Applicant submits that, in view of the above arguments regarding pending Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11-14, 16-21, and 25-26; Claims 27-29 are also in condition for allowance.

Having thus addressed each objection and ground of rejection of the Examiner, pending claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11-14, 16-21, and 25-26, as well as newly presented claims 27-29, are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Entry of the present amendment and reconsideration to that end is respectfully requested.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 14-0620.


Respectfully submitted,

David E. Krekelberg

By his attorney,

Dated:

June 8, 1998



Lawrence M. Nawrocki
Reg. No. 29,333
NAWROCKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON, P.A.
Suite 401, Broadway Place East
3433 Broadway Street Northeast
Minneapolis, MN 55413
Telephone: (612) 331-1464
Facsimile: (612) 331-2239